arXiv:1605.06279v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 20 May 2016

STAGGERED LONG-RANGE ORDER FOR DILUTED QUANTUM SPIN MODELS

ROMAN KOTECKÝ[1,2] AND BENJAMIN LEES[1]

[1] Department of Mathematics, University of Warwick, UK

[2] CTS, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

r.kotecky@warwick.ac.uk, b.lees@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract. We study annealed site diluted quantum lattice spin systems, including the XY model with spin $\frac{1}{2}$ and the Heisenberg antiferromagnet with spin $S \geq \frac{1}{2}$. We find regions of the parameter space where, in spite of being a priori favourable for a densely occupied state, phases with staggered occupancy occur at low temperatures.

1. Introduction

Two quantum spin models (the XY model with spin $\frac{1}{2}$ and the Heisenberg antiferromagnet) on the hypercubic lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ($d \geq 2$) with the annealed site dilution are considered. The models are formulated in terms of the Hamiltonian

$$H = -\frac{1}{S^2} \sum_{\langle x,y \rangle} n_x n_y \left(S_x^1 S_y^1 + u S_x^2 S_y^2 + S_x^3 S_y^3 - S(S+1) \right) - \mu \sum_x n_x - \kappa \sum_{\langle x,y \rangle} n_x n_y. \tag{1.1}$$

Here S_x^i's are the standard spin-S operators acting on the site x and n_x is the occupancy number indicating presence or absence ($n_x = 1$ or $n_x = 0$) of a particle at the site x. The parameters μ and κ are the chemical potential and the interaction parameter for the particle occupancy. The XY model with spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ is obtained by the choosing $(S, u) = (\frac{1}{2}, 0)$ while $S \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $u = -1$ yields the Heisenberg antiferromagnet.

Our main claim concerns the existence of a staggered long range order characterised by the presence of two distinct states (in the thermodynamic limit) with preferential occupation of either the even or the odd sublattice. Indeed,

it will be proven that such states occur in a region of parameters μ and κ, at intermediate inverse temperatures, β.

The existence of such states can be viewed as a demonstration of an "effective entropic repulsion" caused by the interaction of quantum spins leading to an impactful restriction of the "available phase space volume". As a result, occupation of adjacent sites might turn out to be unfavourable—it results in an effective repulsion between particles in nearest neighbour sites and as a result eventually leads to a staggered order. It is easy to understand that this is the case for the annealed site diluted Potts model with large number of spin states q [3] where this effect is indeed caused by a pure entropic repulsion: two nearest neighbour occupied sites contribute the Boltzmann factor $q + q(q-1)e^{-\beta}$ which is at low temperatures much smaller than the factor q^2 obtained from two next nearest neighbour spins that are free to take all possible spin values entirely independently. Actually, the same is true—even though less obvious—in the case of diluted models with classical continuous spins [4]. Our results constitute an extension of similar claims to a quantum situation.

To get a control on effective repulsion, we rely on a standard tool—the chessboard estimates which follow from reflection positivity. The classical references on this topic are [5, 6, 7, 8, 9] with a recent review [1]. For our case the treatment in [2] is especially useful. In particular, we use the setting from [2, Section 3.3] for an efficient formulation of the long range order in terms of coexistence of the corresponding infinite-volume KMS states.

While we are restricting ourselves only to the case $u = 0, -1$, the models with $-1 < u < 0$ are also covered by reflection positivity, hence results might be extended to this region. However, one would require bounds on the expectation of certain occupancy configurations (see Lemmas 3.4-3.7), that seem harder to achieve than in the cases $u = 0, -1$.

We introduce the models and state the main result in Section 2. The proof is deferred to Section 3.

2. Setting and Main Results

For a fixed *even* $L \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the *torus* $\mathbb{T}_L = \mathbb{Z}^d/L\mathbb{Z}^d$ consisting of L^d sites that can be identified with the set $\{-L/2+1, -L/2+2, \dots, L/2-1, L/2\}^d$. On the torus $\mathbb{T}_L$ we take the *algebra* $\mathfrak{A}_L$ *of observables* of all functions $A : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L} \to \mathcal{M}_L$ where $\mathcal{M}_L$ is s the C^*-algebra of linear operators acting on the space $\otimes_{x\in\mathbb{T}_L}\mathbb{C}^{2S+1}$ with $S \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$ (complex $(2S+1)^{|\mathbb{T}_L|}$-dimensional matrices).

A particular example of an observable is the Hamiltonian $H_L \in \mathfrak{A}_L$ of the form (1.1) with the periodic boundary conditions (on the torus $\mathbb{T}_L$),

$$H_L(\boldsymbol{n}) = -\frac{1}{S^2} \sum_{\langle \boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}\rangle \in \mathbb{E}_L} n_{\boldsymbol{x}} n_{\boldsymbol{y}} \left(S^1_{\boldsymbol{x}} S^1_{\boldsymbol{y}} + u S^2_{\boldsymbol{x}} S^2_{\boldsymbol{y}} + S^3_{\boldsymbol{x}} S^3_{\boldsymbol{y}} - S(S+1) \right) - \mu \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{T}_L} n_{\boldsymbol{x}} - \kappa \sum_{\langle \boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}\rangle \in \mathbb{E}_L} n_{\boldsymbol{x}} n_{\boldsymbol{y}}. \quad (2.1)$$

Here, $\mathbb{E}_L$ is the set of all edges connecting nearest neighbour sites in the torus $\mathbb{T}_L$ and (S^1, S^2, S^3) are the spin-S matrices. The Gibbs state on the torus is given by

$$\langle \cdot \rangle_{L,\beta} = \frac{1}{Z_L(\beta)} \sum_{\boldsymbol{n}} \mathrm{Tr}\ \cdot\, \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H_L} \quad (2.2)$$

with $Z_L(\beta) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{n}} \mathrm{Tr}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H_L}$. Infinite volume states of a quantum spin system are formulated in terms of KMS states, an analog of DLR states for classical systems. Let us briefly recall this notion in the form to be used in our situation. Here we follow closely the treatment from [2] which can be consulted for a more detailed discussion of KMS states in a setting similar to ours. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ denote the C^* *algebra of quasilocal observables*,

$$\mathfrak{A} = \overline{\bigcup_L \mathfrak{A}_L}, \quad (2.3)$$

where the overline denotes the norm-closure. We define the *time evolution operators* $\alpha_t^{(L)}$ acting on $A \in \mathfrak{A}_L$ and for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\alpha_t^{(L)}(A) = \mathrm{e}^{itH_L} A \mathrm{e}^{-itH_L}. \quad (2.4)$$

It is well known that for a local operator A we can expand $\alpha_t^{(L)}(A)$ as a series of commutators,

$$\alpha_t^{(L)}(A) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{(it)^m}{m!} [H_L, [H_L, ..., [H_L, A]...]]. \quad (2.5)$$

The map $t \to \alpha_t^{(L)}$ extends to all $t \in \mathbb{C}$ and, as $L \to \infty$, $\alpha_t^{(L)}$ converges in norm to an operator α_t on $\mathfrak{A}$ uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}$ (one can consult the proof, for example, in [10] and see that the same proof structure works in this case). A state $\langle \cdot \rangle_\beta$ on $\mathfrak{A}$ (a positive linear functional ($\langle A \rangle_\beta \geq 0$ if $A \geq 0$) such that $\langle \mathbb{1} \rangle_\beta = 1$) is called a KMS state (or is said to satisfy the KMS condition) with a Hamiltonian H at an inverse temperature β, if we have

$$\langle AB \rangle_\beta = \langle \alpha_{-i\beta}(B) A \rangle_\beta \quad (2.6)$$

for the above defined family of operators α_t at imaginary values $t = -i\beta$. One can see that the Gibbs state (2.2) satisfies the KMS condition for the finite volume time evolution operator.

A special class of *observables* are classical events $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{F}} I$ obtained as a product of the identity $I \in \mathcal{M}_L$ with the indicator $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{F}}$ of an occupation event $\mathcal{F} \subset \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L}$. Often we will consider (classical) block events depending only on the occupation configuration on the block-cube of 2^d sites, $C = \{0,1\}^d \subset \mathbb{T}_L$. Namely, the events of the form $\mathcal{E}\times\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L\setminus C}$ where $\mathcal{E} \subset \{0,1\}^C$. We will refer to these events directly as block events $\mathcal{E}$ and use a streamlined notation $\langle\mathcal{E}\rangle_{L,\beta}$ (resp. $\langle\mathcal{E}\rangle_\beta$) instead of $\langle\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}\times\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L\setminus C}} I\rangle_{L,\beta}$ (resp. $\langle\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}\times\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L\setminus C}} I\rangle_\beta$).

In particular, to characterise the long-range order states mentioned above, we introduce the block events $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}} = \{\boldsymbol{n}^{\mathrm{e}}\}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{o}} = \{\boldsymbol{n}^{\mathrm{o}}\}$ where $\boldsymbol{n}^{\mathrm{e}}$ and $\boldsymbol{n}^{\mathrm{o}}$ are the even and the odd staggered configurations on C: $\boldsymbol{n}^{\mathrm{e}}_{\boldsymbol{x}} = 1$ iff $\boldsymbol{x}$ is an even site in C and $\boldsymbol{n}^{\mathrm{e}}_{\boldsymbol{x}} = 1$ iff $\boldsymbol{x}$ is an odd site in C. Notice that the sets $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{o}}$ are disjoint.

The main result for the quantum system with Hamiltonian (2.1) can now be stated as follows.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $u = -1$ and $S \geq \frac{1}{2}$ or $u = 0$ and $S = \frac{1}{2}$. For each case there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ and a function κ_0 (both depending on u, S, and d) that is positive on $(0, \mu_0)$ and such that for any $\mu > 0$, $\kappa < \max(\kappa_0(\mu), 0)$, and any $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, there exists $\beta_0 = \beta_0(\mu, \kappa, \epsilon)$ such that for any $\beta > \beta_0$ there exist two distinct KMS states, $\langle\cdot\rangle^{\mathrm{e}}_\beta$ and $\langle\cdot\rangle^{\mathrm{o}}_\beta$, that are staggered,*

$$\langle\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}\rangle^{\mathrm{e}}_\beta \geq 1 - \varepsilon \text{ and } \langle\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{o}}\rangle^{\mathrm{o}}_\beta \geq 1 - \varepsilon. \tag{2.7}$$

The proof of this theorem is the content of Section 3. For the technical estimates, we will restrict ourselves to the two-dimensional case $d = 2$. The proof in higher dimensions employing the same methods is straigtforward but rather cumbersome. For $d = 2$ we construct the function κ_0 explicitly.

Notice that the claim is true for any negative κ. This is not so surprising, negative κ triggers antiferromagnetic staggered order at low temperatures. More interesting is the case, established by the theorem, when this happens for positive κ where it is a demonstration of an effective entropic repulsion stemming from the quantum spin.

3. Proof of Theorem 2.1

3.1. **Reflection Positivity for the Annealed Quantum Model.** Consider now a splitting of the torus $\mathbb{T}_L$ into 2 disjoint halves, $\mathbb{T}_L = \mathbb{T}^+_L \cup \mathbb{T}^-_L$, separated by a pair of planes; say, $P_1 = \{(-1/2, x_2, \ldots, x_d)$ and $P_2 = \{(L/2 -$

$1/2, x_2, \dots, x_d)$, $x_2, \dots, x_d \in \mathbb{R}$. We introduce a reflection $\theta : \mathbb{T}_L \to \mathbb{T}_L$ defined by $\theta(\boldsymbol{x}) = (-(x_1+1), x_2, \dots, x_d)$.[1] Any such reflection (parallel P_1 and P_2 of distance $L/2$ in arbitrary half-integer position and orthogonal to any coordinate axis) will be called *reflections through planes between the sites* or simply *reflections* (we will not use the other reflections through planes on the sites that are useful for classical models).

Further, consider two subalgebras $\mathfrak{A}_L^+, \mathfrak{A}_L^- \subset \mathfrak{A}_L$ living on the sets $\mathbb{T}_L^+, \mathbb{T}_L^-$, respectively. Namely, we define $\mathfrak{A}_L^+$ as a set of all operator-valued functions $A : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L^+} \to \mathcal{M}_L^+$, where $\mathcal{M}_L^+$ is the set of all operators of the form $A^+ \otimes I$ acting on the subspace $\otimes_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{T}_L^+}\mathbb{C}^{2S+1}$ and I is the identity on the complementary space $\otimes_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{T}_L^-}\mathbb{C}^{2S+1}$. Similarly for $\mathfrak{A}_L^-$.

The reflection θ can be naturally elevated to an involution $\theta : \mathfrak{A}_L^+ \to \mathfrak{A}_L^-$ acting on $\mathcal{M}_L^+$ in a properly parametrized basis as $\theta(A_+ \otimes I) = I \otimes A_+$ and reflecting the configuration $\boldsymbol{n}$,

$$(\theta A)(\theta \boldsymbol{n}) = \theta(A(\boldsymbol{n})). \tag{3.1}$$

Finally, we say that a state $\langle\cdot\rangle$ on $\mathfrak{A}_L$ is reflection positive with respect to θ if for any $A, B \in \mathfrak{A}_L^+$ we have

$$\left\langle A\overline{\theta B}\right\rangle = \overline{\left\langle B\overline{\theta A}\right\rangle} \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\left\langle A\overline{\theta A}\right\rangle \geq 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Here, $\overline{A}$ denotes the complex conjugation of the matrix A. The standard consequence of the reflection positivity is the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$\langle A\overline{\theta B}\rangle^2 \leq \langle A\overline{\theta A}\rangle\langle B\overline{\theta B}\rangle \tag{3.4}$$

for any $A, B \in \mathfrak{A}_L^+$.

In our situation of an annealed diluted quantum model, we are dealing with the state

$$\langle A\rangle_{L,\beta} = \frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{n}\in\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L}} \operatorname{Tr} A(\boldsymbol{n}) \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H_L(\boldsymbol{n})}}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{n}\in\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L}} \operatorname{Tr} \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H_L(\boldsymbol{n})}} \tag{3.5}$$

for any $A \in \mathfrak{A}_L$ and with the Hamiltonian $H_L \in \mathfrak{A}_L$ of the form (2.1).

The standard proof of reflection positivity may be extended to this case.

[1] Notice that on the torus, the reflection with respect to P_1 is identical with that with respect to P_2 (just notice that $|x_1 - (-1/2)| = |y_1 - (-1/2)|$ with $x_1 \neq y_1$ implies $y_1 = -(x_1+1)$, while $|x_1 - (L/2 - 1/2)| = |y_1 - (L/2 - 1/2)|$ with $x_1 \neq y_1$ implies $y_1 = -(x_1 + L + 1)$ and $-(x_1+1) = -(x_1 + L + 1) \mod (L)$.

Lemma 3.1. *The state $\langle\cdot\rangle_{L,\beta}$ is reflection positive for any θ through planes between the sites and any $\mu, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta \geq 0$, and any $u \leq 0$.*

Proof. The equality (3.2) is immediate. For (3.3) we first write the Hamiltonian H_L in the form $H_L(\boldsymbol{n}, \theta\boldsymbol{m}) = J(\boldsymbol{n}) + \overline{\theta J(\boldsymbol{m})} - \sum_\alpha D_\alpha(\boldsymbol{n})\overline{\theta D_\alpha}(\boldsymbol{m})$ for any $\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{m} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L^+}$ where $J \in \mathfrak{A}_L^+$ consists of all terms of the Hamiltonian with (both) sites in $\mathbb{T}_L^+$ and $D_\alpha\overline{\theta D_\alpha}$, with $D_\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}_L^+$ indexed by α, are representing the terms containing the sites adjacent to both sides to the reflection plane.

Notice that to have a correct negative sign with the terms $D_\alpha\overline{\theta D_\alpha}$, we need the condition $u \leq 0$. Indeed, if $\{x, y\}$ is an edge crossing the reflection plane the corresponding D_α's are $\frac{1}{S^2} n_{\boldsymbol{x}} S^1_{\boldsymbol{x}}$, $\frac{1}{S^2} i\sqrt{-u}\, n_{\boldsymbol{x}} S^2_{\boldsymbol{x}}$, $\frac{1}{S^2} n_{\boldsymbol{x}} S^3_{\boldsymbol{x}}$. Recalling that in the standard basis $\overline{iS^2} = iS^2$, we need $u \leq 0$. Note that the term $\sum_{\langle \boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}\rangle} n_{\boldsymbol{x}} n_{\boldsymbol{y}}(\kappa - S(S+1)/S^2)$ is simply a constant times the identity for each $\boldsymbol{n}$ and can be bounded by $\pm d|\mathbb{T}_L|\,|\kappa - S(S+1)/S^2|$, hence we can pull it out of the trace and the sum as a constant and ignore it, as we do for the remainder of the proof. For the claim (3.3) we need to show that

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{m}\in\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L^+}} \operatorname{Tr} A(\boldsymbol{n})\overline{\theta A}(\boldsymbol{m}) \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H_L(\boldsymbol{n},\theta\boldsymbol{m})} \geq 0 \tag{3.6}$$

for any $A \in \mathfrak{A}_L^+$. Adapting the standard proof, see e.g. [8, Theorem 2.1], by Trotter formula we get

$$\mathrm{e}^{-\beta H_L(\boldsymbol{n},\theta\boldsymbol{m})} = \lim_{k\to\infty}\Big(\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\beta}{k}J(\boldsymbol{n})}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\beta}{k}\overline{\theta J}(\boldsymbol{m})}\big[1+\tfrac{\beta}{k}\sum\nolimits_\alpha D_\alpha(\boldsymbol{n})\overline{\theta D_\alpha}(\boldsymbol{m})\big]\Big)^k =: \lim_{k\to\infty} F_k(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{m}). \tag{3.7}$$

The needed claim will be verified once show that

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{m}\in\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L^+}} \operatorname{Tr}\Big(A(\boldsymbol{n})\overline{\theta A}(\boldsymbol{m})\, F_k(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{m})\Big) \geq 0 \tag{3.8}$$

for all k.

Indeed, proceeding exactly in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [8], we can conclude that for each $\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{m} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L^+}$ the operator $F_k(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{m})$ can be written as a sum of terms of the form $F_k^{(\ell)}(\boldsymbol{n})\overline{\theta F_k^{(\ell)}}(\boldsymbol{m})$, where $F_k^{(\ell)} \in \mathfrak{A}_L^+$. Each such term yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{m}\in\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L^+}} \operatorname{Tr}(A(\boldsymbol{n})\overline{\theta A}(\boldsymbol{m})F_k^{(\ell)}(\boldsymbol{n})\overline{\theta F_k^{(\ell)}}(\boldsymbol{m})) = \\
&= \sum_{\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{m}\in\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L^+}} \operatorname{Tr}(A(\boldsymbol{n})F_k^{(\ell)}(\boldsymbol{n})\overline{\theta(AF_k^{(\ell)})}(\boldsymbol{m})) = \Big|\sum_{\boldsymbol{n}\in\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{T}_L^+}} \operatorname{Tr}(A(\boldsymbol{n})F_k^{(\ell)}(\boldsymbol{n}))\Big|^2 \geq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

completing thus the proof. □

3.2. **Chessboard estimates.** Consider $\mathbb{T}_L$ partitioned into $(L/2)^d$ disjoint $2\times 2\times\cdots\times 2$ blocks $C_{\boldsymbol{t}}\subset\mathbb{T}_L$ labeled by vectors $\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{L/2}$ with $2\boldsymbol{t}$ denoting the position of their lower left corner. Clearly, $C_{\boldsymbol{t}}=C+2\boldsymbol{t}$ with $C_{\boldsymbol{0}}=C$.

If $\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{L/2}$ with $|\boldsymbol{t}|=1$, we let $\theta_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ be the reflection with respect to the plane between C and $C_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ corresponding to $\boldsymbol{t}$. Further, if $\mathcal{E}$ is a block event, $\mathcal{E}\subset\{0,1\}^C$, we let $\vartheta_{\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{E})\subset\{0,1\}^{C_{\boldsymbol{t}}}$ be the correspondingly reflected event, $\boldsymbol{n}\in\mathcal{E}$ iff $\theta\boldsymbol{n}\in\vartheta_{\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{E})$. For other $\boldsymbol{t}$'s in $\mathbb{T}_{L/2}$ we define $\vartheta_{\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{E})$ by a sequence of reflections (note that the result does not depend on the choice of sequence leading from C to $C_{\boldsymbol{t}}$.). If all coordinates of $\boldsymbol{t}$ are even this simply results in the translation by $2\boldsymbol{t}$.

Chessboard estimates are formulated in terms of a mean value of a homogenised pattern based on a block event $\mathcal{E}$ disseminated throughout the lattice,

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{E}):=\Big(\Big\langle\prod_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{L/2}}\vartheta_{\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{E})\Big\rangle_{L,\beta}\Big)^{(2/L)^d}. \tag{3.10}$$

If $u\le 0$, $\mathcal{E}_1,...,\mathcal{E}_m$ are block events, and $\boldsymbol{t}_1,...,\boldsymbol{t}_m\in\mathbb{T}_{L/2}$ are distinct, we get, by a standard repeated use of reflection positivity, the chessboard estimates

$$\Big\langle\prod_{j=1}^m\vartheta_{\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{E}_j)\Big\rangle_{L,\beta}\le\prod_{j=1}^m\Big(\Big\langle\prod_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{L/2}}\vartheta_{\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{E}_j)\Big\rangle_{L,\beta}\Big)^{(2/L)^d}=\prod_{j=1}^m\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{E}_j). \tag{3.11}$$

Note that we have chosen to split $\mathbb{T}_L$ into $2\times 2\times\cdots\times 2$ blocks with the bottom left corner of the basic block C at the origin $(0,0,\dots,0)$. If we had instead replaced the basic block C by its shift $C+\boldsymbol{e}$ by the unit vector $\boldsymbol{e}=(1,0,\dots,0)$, the same estimate would hold with the new partition with all blocks shifted by $\boldsymbol{e}$. We will use this fact in the sequel.

The proof of the useful property of subadditivity of the function $\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}$ for classical systems [1, Lemma 5.9] can be also directly extended to our case.

Lemma 3.2. *If $\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E}_1,\mathcal{E}_2,...$ are events on B such that $\mathcal{E}\subset\cup_k\mathcal{E}_k$, then*

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{E})\le\sum_k\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{E}_k). \tag{3.12}$$

Proof. Using subadditivity of $\langle\cdot\rangle_{L,\beta}$, we get

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{E})^{(L/2)^d}=\Big\langle\prod_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{L/2}}\vartheta_{\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{E})\Big\rangle_{L,\beta}\le\sum_{(k_{\boldsymbol{t}})}\Big\langle\prod_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{L/2}}\vartheta_{\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{E}_{k_{\boldsymbol{t}}})\Big\rangle_{L,\beta} \tag{3.13}$$

Using now the chessboard estimate

$$\Big\langle \prod_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{L/2}} \vartheta_{\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{E}_{k_{\boldsymbol{t}}})\Big\rangle_{L,\beta} \le \prod_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{L/2}} \mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{E}_{k_{\boldsymbol{t}}}), \tag{3.14}$$

we get

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{E})^{(L/2)^d} \le \sum_{(k_{\boldsymbol{t}})} \prod_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{L/2}} \mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{E}_{k_{\boldsymbol{t}}}) = \\ = \prod_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\mathbb{T}_{L/2}} \Big(\sum_k \mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{E}_k)\Big) = \Big(\sum_k \mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{E}_k)\Big)^{(L/2)^d}. \tag{3.15}$$

□

Let us introduce the set $\mathcal{B}$ of bad configurations, $\mathcal{B} = \{0,1\}^C \setminus (\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}} \cup \mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{o}})$, and use $\tau_{\boldsymbol{r}}$ to denote the shift by $\boldsymbol{r} \in \mathbb{T}_L$. The proof of the existence of two distinct KMS states is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *There exists a function κ_0 as stated in Theorem 2.1 such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mu > 0$ and $\kappa < \kappa_0(\mu)$ there exists β_0 such that for any $\beta > \beta_0$, any L sufficiently large, and any distinct $\boldsymbol{t}_1, \boldsymbol{t}_2 \in \mathbb{T}_L$,*

$$\langle \mathcal{B}\rangle_{L,\beta} < \varepsilon, \tag{3.16}$$

$$\langle \tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}_1}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}) \cap \tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}_2}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{o}})\rangle_{L,\beta} < \varepsilon. \tag{3.17}$$

Deffering its proof to the next section, we show here how it implies Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 given Lemma 3.3. We closely follow the proof of Lemma 4.5 and Proposition 3.9 in [2]. Define

$$\mathbb{T}_L^{\mathrm{front}} = \{x \in \mathbb{T}_L : -\lfloor L/4 - 1/2\rfloor \le x_1 \le \lceil L/4 - 1/2\rceil\}. \tag{3.18}$$

We denote by $\mathfrak{U}_L^{\mathrm{front}}$ the algebra of observables localised in $\mathbb{T}_L^{\mathrm{front}}$.

Let $\Delta_M \subset \mathbb{T}_{L/2}$ be a $M\times M$ block of sites on the "back" of $\mathbb{T}_{L/2}$ ($\mathrm{dist}(0,\Delta_M) \ge L/4 - M$). Then for a block event $\mathcal{E}$ depending only on the occupancy in C define

$$\rho_{L,M}(\mathcal{E}) = \frac{1}{|\Delta_M|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{t}\in\Delta_M} \tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{E}). \tag{3.19}$$

If $\langle \mathcal{E}\rangle_{L,\beta} \ge c$ for all $L \gg 1$ for a constant $c > 0$ then we can define a new state on $\mathfrak{U}_L^{\mathrm{front}}$, by

$$\langle\cdot\rangle_{L,M;\beta} = \frac{\langle \rho_{L,M}(\mathcal{E})\,\cdot\,\rangle_{L,\beta}}{\langle \rho_{L,M}(\mathcal{E})\rangle_{L,\beta}}. \tag{3.20}$$

We claim that if $\langle\ \rangle_\beta$ is a weak limit of $\langle\ \rangle_{L,M;\beta}$ as $L\to\infty$ and then $M\to\infty$ then $\langle\ \rangle_\beta$ is a KMS state at inverse temperature β invariant under translations by $2\boldsymbol{t}$ for $\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathbb{T}_L$.

Indeed translation invariance comes from the spatial averaging in $\rho_{L,M}(\mathcal{E})$. As in [2] we need to show that $\langle\ \rangle_\beta$ satisfies the KMS condition (2.6). For an observable A on the 'front' of the torus, $\mathbb{T}_L^{\text{front}}$, we have

$$[\alpha_t^{(L)}(A), \rho_{L,M}(\mathcal{E})] \to 0 \text{ as } L \to \infty \tag{3.21}$$

in norm topology uniformly for t in compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}$. Using this and (2.6) for the finite volume Gibbs states we have that for A, B bounded operators on the "front" of the torus

$$\langle \rho_{L,M}(\mathcal{E})AB\rangle_{L,\beta} = \langle \rho_{L,M}(\mathcal{E})\alpha_{-i\beta}^{(L)}(A)B\rangle_{L,\beta} + o(1) \text{ as } L \to \infty. \tag{3.22}$$

Because $\alpha_{-i\beta}^{(L)}(B) \to \alpha_{-i\beta}(B)$ as $L \to \infty$ in norm we have that $\langle\ \rangle_{L,M;\beta}$ converges as $L \to \infty$ and then $M \to \infty$ to a KMS state at inverse temperature β.

The proof of Theorem 2.1 follows by taking $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{G}^{\text{e}}$ or $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{G}^{\text{o}}$ as we know both staggered occupations have the same expectation we can define a state $\langle\ \rangle_{L,M;\beta}^{\text{e}}$, using Lemma 3.3 we conclude that $\langle \rho_{L,M}(\mathcal{G}^{\text{e}})\rangle_{L,\beta}$ is uniformly positive and hence

$$\langle \tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{G}^{\text{e}})\rangle_{L,M;\beta}^{\text{e}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \tag{3.23}$$

for any $\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathbb{T}_L^{\text{front}}$ (if $M \ll L/2$) and similarly for $\langle\ \rangle_{L,M;\beta}^{\text{o}}$. If ε is small enough then the right-hand side of this inequality will be greater than $1/2$, hence in the thermodynamic limit $\mathcal{G}^{\text{e}}$ will dominate. □

To prove Lemma 3.3 we use a version of Peierls' argument hinging on chessboard estimates.

3.3. **Peierls argument.** For a given occupation configuration, consider the event $\tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}_1}(\mathcal{G}^{\text{e}}) \cap \tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}_2}(\mathcal{G}^{\text{o}})$ that the blocks $C_{\boldsymbol{t}_1}$ and $C_{\boldsymbol{t}_2}$ have different staggered configurations described by $\mathcal{G}^{\text{e}}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\text{o}}$ respectively. The idea is to show the existence of a contour separating the points $\boldsymbol{t}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{t}_2$ and to use chessboard estimates to show that occurence of such a countour is unprobable.

Consider the set of all blocks (labeled by) $\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathbb{T}_{L/2}$ such that a translation of the even staggered configuration $\tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{G}^{\text{e}})$ is occurring on it. Let $\Delta \subset \mathbb{T}_{L/2}$ be its connected component containing $\boldsymbol{t}_1$. Consider the component $\overline{\Delta} \subset \mathbb{T}_{L/2}$ of Δ^{c} containing $\boldsymbol{t}_2$. The set of edges γ of the graph $\mathbb{T}_{L/2}$ between vertices of $\overline{\Delta}$ and its complement $\overline{\Delta}^{\text{c}}$ is a minimal cutset of Δ. Informally, γ is a contour between Δ with all its holes except the one containing $\boldsymbol{t}_2$ filled up and the remaining component containing $\boldsymbol{t}_2$— *a contour separating* $\boldsymbol{t}_1$ *and* $\boldsymbol{t}_2$. The standard fact is that the number of contours with a fixed number of edges $|\gamma| = n$ separating two vertices $\boldsymbol{t}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{t}_2$ is bounded by c^n with a suitable constant c.

Given a contour γ of length $|\gamma| = n$, there exists a coordinate direction such that there are at least n/d edges in γ aligned along this direction. Precisely half of them have their outer endpoint (the vertex in $\overline{\Delta}$) "on the left" of its inner endpoint, choosing (arbitrarily) the direction of the chosen coordinate axis (without loss of generality we can take for this the first coordinate axis) as $\boldsymbol{e}_1$, there are at least $n/(2d)$ edges $\{\boldsymbol{t}, \boldsymbol{t}+\boldsymbol{e}_1\}$ such that $\boldsymbol{t} \in \overline{\Delta}$ and $\boldsymbol{t}+\boldsymbol{e}_1 \in \Delta$.

Now, the crucial claim is that with each contour we can associate at least $1/2$ of the $n/(2d)$ bad blocks (with a configuration from $\vartheta_{2\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{B})$), all belonging to a given fixed partition: either to our original partition of $\mathbb{T}_L$ labelled by $\mathbb{T}_{L/2}$ or to a new partition of $\mathbb{T}_L$ with the basic block C shifted by a unit vector from $\mathbb{T}_L$ in direction $\boldsymbol{e}_1$. Indeed, any block corresponding to an outer vertex $\boldsymbol{t}$ above is either bad or, if not, it has to be a translation $\tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{o}})$ of the odd staggered configuration (being the even staggered configuration would be in contradiction with the assumption that Δ is a component of the set of blocks with even staggered configuration). However, then the block shifted by a unit vector in $\mathbb{T}_L$ in direction $\boldsymbol{e}_1$ features an odd staggered configuration on its left-hand half and an even staggered configurations on its right-hand half, i.e., a configuration that belongs to the properly shifted set $\mathcal{B}$ (here it is helpful that the set $\mathcal{B}$ is invariant with respect to the reflection through the middle plane of the block).

We use $S(\gamma)$ to denote this collection of at least $|\gamma|/(4d)$ bad blocks associated with contour γ. Given that, according to the construction above, all blocks from $S(\gamma)$ belong to the same partition (either the original one or a shifted one), we can use the chessboard estimate based on the the corresponding partition to bound the probability that all blocks of a given set $S(\gamma)$ are bad by

$$\Big\langle \prod_{\boldsymbol{t}\in S(\gamma)} \vartheta_{\boldsymbol{t}}(\mathcal{B}) \Big\rangle_{L,\beta} \leq \mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{B})^{|S(\gamma)|}. \tag{3.24}$$

As a result, assuming that $\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{B}) \leq 1$ (we will later show it can be made arbitrarily small), the expectation of the event $\tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}_1}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}) \cap \tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}_2}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{o}})$ is bounded by

$$\Big\langle \tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}_1}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}) \cap \tau_{2\boldsymbol{t}_2}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{o}}) \Big\rangle_{L,\beta} \leq \sum_{\gamma \text{ separating } \boldsymbol{t}_1 \text{ and } \boldsymbol{t}_2} \mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{B})^{|\gamma|/(4d)} 2^{|\gamma|/(2d)+1}. \tag{3.25}$$

Here, $2^{|\gamma|/(2d)+1}$ is the bound on the number of sets $S(\gamma)$ associated with the contour γ once the direction $\boldsymbol{e}_1$ is chosen.

This leads to the final bound

$$\left\langle \tau_{2t_1}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}) \cap \tau_{2t_2}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{o}}) \right\rangle_{L,\beta} \leq \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} 2(4\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{B})^{n/(4d)})c^n. \tag{3.26}$$

We now see that Lemma 3.3 will hold if $\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{B})$ can be made arbitrarily small by tuning the parameters of the model correctly. Hence we turn our attention to this.

For the remaining technical part of this section we restrict ourselves to the *two-dimensional case*.

For $d = 2$, the set $\mathcal{B}$ consists of 14 configurations that can be classified into five events according to the number of sites in C that are occupied, $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^{(0)} \cup \mathcal{B}^{(1)} \cup \mathcal{B}^{(2)} \cup \mathcal{B}^{(3)} \cup \mathcal{B}^{(4)}$. Here, $\mathcal{B}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(4)}$ consist of a single configuration (empty and full, respectively) and $\mathcal{B}^{(1)}, \mathcal{B}^{(2)}, \mathcal{B}^{(3)}$ consist each of 4 configurations related by symetries. Notice that the event $\mathcal{B}^{(2)}$ has precisely two occupied sites at neighbouring positions (excluding the configurations $\boldsymbol{n}^{\mathrm{e}}$ and $\boldsymbol{n}^{\mathrm{o}}$).

By subadditivity we can bound $\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{B})$ by the sum of expectations of homogenised patterns based on the fourteen configurations from $\mathcal{B}$ disseminated throughout the lattice by reflections. Of course, in view of the symmetries, we can consider only 5 configurations $\boldsymbol{n}^{(k)}, k = 0, 1, \ldots, 4$, one from each event $\mathcal{B}^{(k)}, k = 0, 1, \ldots, 4$.

We use $Z_L^{(k)}(\beta)$ to denote the corresponding quantities

$$Z_L^{(k)}(\beta) = \mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(k)}\})^{(L/2)^2} Z_L(\beta), \tag{3.27}$$

for $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, 4\}$. For notational consistency we also denote the contribution of staggered configurations on $\mathbb{T}_L$ as $Z_L^{\mathrm{e}}(\beta)$ and $Z_L^{\mathrm{o}}(\beta)$.

Lemma 3.4. *For any $u, \mu, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|u| \leq 1$ we have*

$$Z_L^{(0)}(\beta) = (2S+1)^{L^2}, \tag{3.28}$$

$$Z_L^{\mathrm{e}}(\beta) = Z_L^{\mathrm{o}}(\beta) = \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{2}\beta\mu L^2}(2S+1)^{L^2}. \tag{3.29}$$

Proof. It follows immediately from the observation that in these cases there are no interactions between spins at neighbouring sites. □

Obtaining bounds for the remaining disseminated configurations is more difficult and will be done separately for the two considered types of quantum spin models. First we prove estimates for the antiferromagnetic case.

Lemma 3.5. *For $u = -1$ (the antiferromagnet) and any $\mu, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$Z_L^{(1)}(\beta) \le (2S+1)^{L^2} \exp\Big\{\beta L^2 (\tfrac{\mu}{4} + \tfrac{\kappa}{4} - \tfrac{1}{8S})\Big\}, \tag{3.30}$$

$$Z_L^{(2)}(\beta) \le (2S+1)^{L^2} \exp\Big\{\beta L^2 (\tfrac{\mu}{2} + \tfrac{3\kappa}{4} - \tfrac{1}{2S})\Big\}, \tag{3.31}$$

$$Z_L^{(3)}(\beta) \le (2S+1)^{L^2} \exp\Big\{\beta L^2 (\tfrac{3\mu}{4} + \tfrac{5\kappa}{4} - \tfrac{7}{8S})\Big\}, \tag{3.32}$$

$$Z_L^{(4)}(\beta) \le (2S+1)^{L^2} \exp\Big\{\beta L^2 (\mu + 2\kappa - \tfrac{3}{2S})\Big\}. \tag{3.33}$$

Proof. We present the proof for $Z_L^{(4)}(\beta)$ and $Z_L^{(3)}(\beta)$, the other two inequalities follow by a simpler application of the same method. First, using the unitary operator $U = \prod_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{T}_L^e} \mathrm{e}^{i\pi S_{\boldsymbol{x}}^2}$, we get

$$Z_L^{(4)}(\beta) = \exp\Big\{\beta L^2 (\mu + 2\kappa - \tfrac{2S(S+1)}{S^2})\Big\} \operatorname{Tr} \exp\Big\{-\tfrac{\beta}{S^2} \sum_{\langle \boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}\rangle} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}}\Big\}. \tag{3.34}$$

For a site $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ consider its four nearest neighbours $\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2, \boldsymbol{x}_3, \boldsymbol{x}_4$. The operator $-\sum_{\langle \boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}\rangle} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}}$ can be written as as a sum of $L^2/2$ operators of the form of $B_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}^{(4)} := -\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}_0} \cdot (\sum_{k=1}^4 \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}_k})$ summing over $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ on even sublattice. According to [5, Theorem C.2], the largest eigenvalue of each operator $B_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}^{(4)}$ is $S(4S+1)$. As a result, we get the bound

$$\operatorname{Tr} \exp\Big\{-\tfrac{\beta}{S^2} \sum_{\langle \boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}\rangle} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{y}}\Big\} \le (2S+1)^{L^2} \exp\Big\{\beta L^2 \tfrac{4S+1}{2S}\Big\}. \tag{3.35}$$

Combining with the prefactor, the inequality follows.

For $Z_L^{(3)}(\beta)$ we follow the same procedure combining, however, operators $B_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}^{(\ell)} := -\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}_0} \cdot (\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}_k})$, with $\ell = 1,2,3,4$ neighbours of $\boldsymbol{x}_0$. Note that a dissemination of a block of three occupied and one unoccupied site throughout the lattice via reflections yields a pattern where $1/4$ of the 2×2 blocks are empty and the remaining blocks are full, with the empty blocks evenly spaced throughout the lattice. Thus there are $5L^2/4$ edges with both endsites occupied and we can tile these edges by $L^2/8$ copies of each of the operators $B_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}^{(\ell)}$, $\ell = 1,2,3,4$. Observe that $(4+3+2+1)L^2/8 = 5L^2/4$ yields the correct number of edges. Nevertheless a tiling yielding the claimed bound uses $L^2/8$ operators $B_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}^{(4)}$ and $L^2/4$ operators $B_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}^{(3)}$ arranged in each 16×16 cell as shown below.



The inequality follows by using the claim [5, Theorem C.2] that the largest eigenvalue of the operator $B^{(\ell)}_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}$ is $S(\ell S+1)$. Collecting the terms we get the claimed bound.

The pattern of $Z^{(2)}_L(\beta)$ consists of alternating double lines of occupied and unoccupied sites resulting in tiling with $L^2/4$ operators of the form $B^{(3)}_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}$ whose largest eigenvalue is $S(3S+1)$.

The bound for $Z^{(1)}_L(\beta)$ is also straightforward with $L^2/4$ edges and $L^2/8$ of operators $B^{(2)}_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}$ whose largest eigenvalue is $S(2S+1)$. Notice that tiling with $L^2/4$ of operators $B^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}$ would be also possible, but would lead to a bigger bound. □

The corresponding inequalities for the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ XY model are as follows.

Lemma 3.6. *For the quantum XY model ($u = 0$) with $S = \frac{1}{2}$ and any $\mu, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$Z^{(1)}_L(\beta) \le 2^{L^2} \exp\Big\{\beta L^2\big(\tfrac{\mu}{4}+\tfrac{\kappa}{4}+\tfrac{\sqrt{2}}{4}-3\big)\Big\}, \tag{3.36}$$

$$Z^{(2)}_L(\beta) \le 2^{L^2} \exp\Big\{\beta L^2\big(\tfrac{\mu}{2}+\tfrac{3\kappa}{4}-\tfrac{5}{4}\big)\Big\}, \tag{3.37}$$

$$Z^{(3)}_L(\beta) \le 2^{L^2} \exp\Big\{\beta L^2\big(\tfrac{3\mu}{4}+\tfrac{5\kappa}{4}+\tfrac{\sqrt{6}-11}{4}\big)\Big\}, \tag{3.38}$$

$$Z^{(4)}_L(\beta) \le 2^{L^2} \exp\Big\{\beta L^2\big(\mu+2\kappa+\sqrt{6}-6\big)\Big\}. \tag{3.39}$$

Proof. The calculation is straightforward using the same method as in Lemma 3.5 with operators $A^{(\ell)}_{\boldsymbol{x}_0} := S^1_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}\big(\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} S^1_{\boldsymbol{x}_k}\big)+S^2_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}\big(\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} S^2_{\boldsymbol{x}_k}\big)$. Their largest eigenvalue according to [5, Theorem C.1] is $\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{m(m+1)}$ if $\ell = 2m$ and $\frac{1}{2}m$ if $\ell = 2m-1$, i.e., $1/2$, $\sqrt{2}/2, 1$, and $\sqrt{6}/2$ for the operators $A^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}, A^{(2)}_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}, A^{(3)}_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}$, and $A^{(4)}_{\boldsymbol{x}_0}$, respectively. □

As a result, we are getting the following bounds on the expectations of the disseminated bad configurations $\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(k)}\})$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, 4$.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $u, \mu, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}$. We have*

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(0)}\}) \leq \mathrm{e}^{-2\beta\mu}. \tag{3.40}$$

Further we have for $u = -1$ (the antiferromagnet),

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(1)}\}) \leq \exp\Big\{\beta(-\mu + \kappa - \tfrac{1}{2S})\Big\}, \tag{3.41}$$

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(2)}\}) \leq \exp\Big\{\beta(3\kappa - \tfrac{2}{S})\Big\}, \tag{3.42}$$

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(3)}\}) \leq \exp\Big\{\beta(\mu + 5\kappa - \tfrac{7}{2S})\Big\}, \tag{3.43}$$

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(4)}\}) \leq \exp\Big\{\beta(2\mu + 8\kappa - \tfrac{6}{S})\Big\}, \tag{3.44}$$

and for $u = 0$ and $S = \frac{1}{2}$ (the XY model),

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(1)}\}) \leq \exp\Big\{\beta(-\mu + \kappa + \sqrt{2} - 12)\Big\}, \tag{3.45}$$

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(2)}\}) \leq \exp\Big\{\beta(3\kappa - 5)\Big\}, \tag{3.46}$$

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(3)}\}) \leq \exp\Big\{\beta(\mu + 5\kappa + \sqrt{6} - 11)\Big\}, \tag{3.47}$$

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(4)}\}) \leq \exp\Big\{\beta(2\mu + 8\kappa - 4(6 - \sqrt{6}))\Big\}. \tag{3.48}$$

Proof. All the estimates follow from the previous lemmas using

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(k)}\}) = \left(\frac{Z_L^{(k)}(\beta)}{Z_L(\beta)}\right)^{(2/L)^2} \leq \left(\frac{Z_L^{(k)}(\beta)}{2Z_L^{\mathrm{e}}(\beta)}\right)^{(2/L)^2}. \tag{3.49}$$

□

Further, using subadditivity (Lemma 3.2) we have

$$\mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\mathcal{B}) \leq \mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(0)}\}) + 4\sum_{k=1}^{3} \mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(k)}\}) + \mathfrak{q}_{L,\beta}(\{\boldsymbol{n}^{(4)}\}). \tag{3.50}$$

From Lemma 3.7 we can see that if we choose $\mu > 0$ and κ sufficiently small, the upper bounds on the disseminated events can simultaneously be made arbitrarily small by choosing β sufficiently large.

More precisely, we see that there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ and a function κ_0 that is positive on $(0, \mu_0)$ such that if $\mu > 0$, $\kappa < \max(\kappa_0(\mu), 0)$, and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\beta_0(\mu, \kappa, \epsilon)$ such that the claims of the Lemma 3.3 and thus also Theorem 2.1 are valid for any $\beta \geq \beta_0$.

Explicit expressions for the function κ_0 are

$$\kappa_0(\mu) = \min(\tfrac{2}{3S}, \tfrac{1}{2S} + \mu, \tfrac{7}{10S} - \tfrac{\mu}{5}, \tfrac{3}{4S} - \tfrac{\mu}{4}) \tag{3.51}$$

for the case of an antiferromagnet ($u = -1$) with spin S and

$$\kappa_0(\mu) = \min(\tfrac{5}{3}, \tfrac{6-\sqrt{6}}{2} - \tfrac{\mu}{4}) \tag{3.52}$$

for the case of XY model with spin $1/2$.

Acknowledgement

The research of R.K. was partly supported by the grant GAČR 16-15238S. The research of B.L is supported by EPSRC grant EP/HO23364/1.

References

[1] *Biskup, M.* Reflection positivity and phase transitions in lattice spin models. *Meth. Cont. Math. Stat. Phys.*, 1970:1–86, 2009.

[2] *Biskup, M., Chayes, L. and Starr, S.* Quantum spin systems at positive temperature. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 269:611–657, 2007.

[3] *Chayes, L., Kotecký, R. and Shlosman, S.* Aggregation and intermediate phases in dilute spin systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 171:203–232, 1995.

[4] *Chayes, L., Kotecký, R. and Shlosman, S.* Staggered phases in diluted systems with continuous spins. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 189:631–640, 1997.

[5] *Dyson, F. J., Lieb, E. H. and Simon, B.* Phase transitions in quantum spin systems with isotropic and nonisotropic interactions. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 18(4):335–383, 1978.

[6] *Fröhlich, J., Israel, R., Lieb, E. and Simon, B.* Phase transitions and reflection positivity. I. General theory and long range lattice models. *Comm. Math. Phys*, 62(1):1–34, 1978.

[7] *Fröhlich, J., Israel, R., Lieb, E. and Simon, B.* Phase transitions and reflection positivity. II. Lattice systems with short-range and Coulomb interactions. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 22(3):297–347, 1980.

[8] *Fröhlich, J., Lieb, E. H.* Phase transitions in anisotropic lattice spin systems. *Comm. Math. Phys*, 60(1):233–267, 1978.

[9] *Fröhlich, J., Simon, B. and Spencer, T.* Infrared bounds, phase transitions and continuous symmetry breaking. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 50(1): 79–95, 1976.

[10] *Robinson, D.* Statistical mechanics of quantum spin systems. II. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 7(3): 337-348, 1968.